

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

PIN: 7024
APPLICANT NAME: Monterey Peninsula Water Management District
PROJECT TITLE: Monterey Peninsula Project Proposal
FUNDS REQUESTED: \$27,260,150
COST MATCH: \$ 7,761,950
TOTAL PROJECT COST: \$35,022,100

DESCRIPTION: The grant fund request totals \$27.3 million with a local contribution of \$7.8 million (22.2% of total project costs). Many of the projects are anticipated to begin starting in 2007, although several projects are already in the initial planning stages. Geographically, there are projects in nearly every major watershed in the Planning Region and several involve improving near-shore water quality in the Monterey Bay. Funds requested for these projects would be used for a variety of purposes including planning, design, construction, monitoring, education, and conservation. Five projects include planning, design, and construction activities that would directly address key issues and objectives in the IRWM/ICWM Plan. Six projects include planning and design that would facilitate future construction. The remaining six projects use passive resource conservation measures.

Question: Consistency with Minimum IRWM Standards - This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards.

Pass

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption. Weighting factor is 1. 2

The applicant is developing an FED entitled "Monterey Peninsula, Carmel Bay, and South Monterey Bay Integrated Regional Water Management Plan and Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plan." The applicant and 21 participating agencies intend to adopt the FED by December 31, 2006.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Description of Region. Weighting factor is 1. 3

The regional map in the draft FED does not show either the project locations or the member agencies, but will reportedly be updated in the Final FED to add land uses, critical infrastructure, etc. The map in the application shows project locations. Surface water and groundwater supplies and future demands are described. Additional information on municipal water supplies and wastewater systems would be provided in the Final FED. Social, cultural, and economic conditions in the region are only briefly discussed; more information is needed in the Final FED. Ecological and environmental resources are adequately described. The regional boundaries appear to have been chosen to coincide with the applicant's service area with the addition of the Seaside Basin which provides well water to residents in the region.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Objectives. Weighting factor is 1. 4

A set of preliminary objectives is in the draft FED, but it is not clear how they were developed or determined. Many other potential objectives are identified which will be evaluated for possible inclusion into the Final FED.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Water Management Strategies and Integration. Weighting factor is 1. 3

A full range of water management strategies is discussed and considered in the FED, but they are not clearly linked to specific objectives. There is not much discussion of how these strategies work together or what would be the added benefit of integrating multiple strategies.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Priorities and Schedule. Weighting factor is 1. 3

Regional implementation priorities are not well developed in the FED, but will be developed for the Final FED. A list of initial short- and long-term priorities and projects is provided. All have estimated start and end dates. A process to make decisions about priorities and how to adjust them based on implementation results would be developed for the Final FED. The current priorities appear to be based on regulatory requirements.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Implementation. Weighting factor is 1.

2

Specific tasks identified in the FED detail how and when the final FED will be developed. Proposed 18 implementation projects are described in the FED, but only 17 of them are in the grant proposal. The entities responsible for each project are not identified in the draft FED, but they are identified in the application. Linkages between the projects are not identified. Neither the current status of the elements to ensure project IRWMP implementation nor economic and technical feasibility is presented.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Impacts and Regional Benefits. Weighting factor is 1.

2

An initial identification of some impacts that the FED intends to address is provided. However, the impacts and benefits section did not fully document how the FED would be beneficial to the region. Negative impacts from implementation of the FED are not described. Any advantages of regional planning as opposed to local planning areas not discussed. Interregional impacts and benefits are not discussed, but are likely to occur given the overlapping water management issues involving adjacent regions. DACs are not mentioned. Impacts and benefits to other resources are not discussed.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Technical Analysis and Plan Performance. Weighting factor is 1

2

The technical methods and analyses used to select water management strategies are not discussed. Documents that support some of these strategies are listed. Data gaps are not identified as such, but several strategies are identified as needing to have more information developed about them (e.g. water recycling, wetlands development). The measures and monitoring systems that would be used to evaluate plan performance are not identified. Adaptive management mechanisms are not discussed.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Data Management. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The method for managing data is not clear. The applicant currently provides existing data to the public using CDs, e-mails, or hard copies. The state of existing monitoring efforts is not discussed. The type of data to be collected during plan development and implementation is not identified. Potential integration of data into the SWAMP or GAMA systems is not mentioned. The Final FED would be posted on the CERES, but no other statewide data needs are discussed.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Financing. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The FED briefly mentions beneficiaries of plan implementation. Financing for implementation is not provided but would be provided by each implementing entity in the future on a project-by-project basis. O&M costs are discussed for only 2 of the 17 projects.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Relation to Local Planning & Sustainability. Weighting factor is 1.

2

Local planning and management efforts and coordination with local decision makers are not discussed in the FED. Some planning documents are referenced for future coordination with the FED.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The process for stakeholder involvement in plan development and implementation is not discussed in the FED. Participating agencies are identified, but other stakeholders are not identified. The areas of responsibility of State and federal agencies related to the FED are identified. DACs and environmental justice concerns are not discussed.

Question: Funding Match. This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated the ability to meet the minimum funding match or has requested a waiver or reduction in the funding match.

Pass

Question: Description of Proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

6

The 17 proposed projects are described in various levels of detail and have a good mixture of integrated projects. The goals and objectives of the proposal are detailed as "Key Issues" but are not independently or uniformly described. Requirements for compliance with CEQA are briefly described for some projects and identified as unknown for other projects. A scientific basis for most of the projects is not provided. 12 projects are identified as being consistent with efforts to control NPS pollution, but it is not explained how.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Project Prioritization. Weighting factor is 2.

6

There are 17 prioritized projects listed in the proposal. The applicant prioritizes all the projects and all the projects are included for funding. The prioritization process did not eliminate any projects. There are 15 potential short-term priorities identified in the FED, but how the priorities relate to the 17 projects is not explained. The proposal appears to address several of the objectives in the FED, but it is not clear why these projects were chosen or are most relevant to meeting goals of the FED.

Question: Cost Estimate. Weighting factor is 1.

3

Most of the costs are adequate, but are not consistently justified and some do not provide detailed cost estimates. Costs estimates are provided for each of the 17 projects and are broken down into categories (e.g., land costs, design, construction, etc.). Cost estimates are preliminary for some projects (e.g., #2) as they have only done initial feasibility studies and therefore the costs estimates provided are too general to evaluate reasonableness. Some projects are to conduct studies (e.g., #4 and #6). It is not possible to know if the estimated costs for the studies are reasonable. For example, project #4 is to study restoration of the Carmel River Floodplain, but the scope of work for the study will not be developed until 2007.

Question: Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.

5

Adequate schedules are provided for the 17 proposed projects.

Question: Need. Weighting factor is 2.

6

How individual projects address specific needs is described in Section 3 (Key Issues). The current water supply system is described, but the long-term needs are not quantified. Local environmental and economic conditions are only briefly discussed in Attachment 9. A discussion of water quality, storm water, and flood management needs would have been helpful.

Question: Disadvantaged Communities. Weighting factor is 2.

2

Attachment 10 only marginally addresses this criterion and consists of two sentences. Attachment 10 states only that "No disadvantaged communities or environmental justice concerns were identified for this proposal."

Question: Program Preferences. Weighting factor is 1.

3

All IRWMP grant program preferences are briefly discussed except for providing safe drinking water and water quality projects serving DACs. The discussion mostly refers to other sections of the application, instead of explaining how the projects meet the Program Preferences.

TOTAL SCORE: 60
